



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/436,506	11/09/1999	THOMAS WILLIAM BISH	TU9-99-036	6740
24033	7590 11/24/2003		EXAM	INER
KONRAD RAYNES VICTOR & MANN, LLP			ALI, MOHAMMAD	
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE SUITE 210			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BEVERLY	BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212		2177	
			DATE MAILED: 11/24/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/436,506	BISH ET AL.
Havioory Housen	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mohammad Ali	2177
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 19 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment which	ition. A proper reply to a places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officield, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply cellater than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) _ they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE:	•	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		idered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		•
Claim(s) allowed:	•	
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: 1-27.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	· •
10. Other:		
J -	Jo	hn & Brene

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER Paper No. 15
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Tanaka and Arnon teaches "two storage devices that have same data set and in response to an access request,....." at col. 2, lines 43-46, col. 10, lines 37-44, Tanaka and col. 14, lines 19-26, Arnon.